United Nations ST/AI/2010/5

Secretariat

30 April 2010

Administrative instruction

Performance Management and Development System

The Under-Secretary-General for Management, pursuant to section 4.2 of Secretary-General's bulletin ST/SGB/2009/4, and for the purpose of updating the policies and procedures for performance evaluation and for replacing the Performance Appraisal System with the Performance Management and Development System, pursuant to staff rule 1.3, promulgates the following:

Section 1
Scope of application

The present instruction shall apply to all staff members who hold appointments of at least one year except for staff at the levels of Assistant Secretary-General who report to the Under-Secretary-General in their respective area of work and staff at the level of Under-Secretary-General who report directly to the Secretary-General. The present instruction does not apply to staff holding temporary appointments. Staff members with temporary appointments are evaluated under the provisions of the administrative instruction on temporary appointments.[1]

Section 2
Purpose

2.1 The purpose of the Performance Management and Development System is to improve the delivery of programmes by optimizing performance at all levels, which it will achieve by:

(a) Promoting a culture of high performance, personal development and continuous learning;

(b) Empowering managers and holding them responsible and accountable for managing their staff;

(c) Encouraging a high level of staff participation in the planning, delivery and evaluation of work;

(d) Recognizing successful performance and addressing underperformance in a fair and equitable manner.

[1] See ST/AI/2010/4.

10-33899 (E) 060510

Please recycle

2.2 The function of the Performance Management and Development System is to promote communication between staff members and supervisors on the goals and key results to be achieved and the success criteria by which individual performance will be assessed. The System will also promote continuous learning, recognize successful performance and address performance shortcomings.

2.3 The Performance Management and Development System is supported by an electronic application (e-PAS or e-performance) that captures the main stages of the performance process (workplan, midpoint review and end-of-year performance appraisal).

Section 3
Performance evaluation cycle

3.1 Except as provided in sections 3.2 and 3.3 of the present instruction, the performance cycle shall be 12 months. The cycle begins on 1 April of each year and ends on 31 March of the following year. However, as provided in sections 3.2 and 3.3, the performance period may be shorter or longer than the 12-month cycle, normally not less than 6 months or longer than 18 months.

3.2 When a staff member takes up new duties upon recruitment, transfer or assignment in the course of the performance year, an individual workplan shall be established within the first two months of assumption of the new function. If a staff member actively serves with the United Nations for less than six months during the performance cycle, no e-PAS or e-performance document is required to be completed.

3.3 When a staff member takes up new duties upon reassignment or transfer, the e-PAS or e-performance document shall be completed by the staff member and his/her supervisor for the period between the beginning of the performance period and the date of reassignment, transfer or separation. If the staff member remains in the same functions but serves under successive supervisors during the year, the supervisor of the staff member at the time the performance cycle ends shall complete the end-of-year evaluation, and prior supervisors should be consulted or, if applicable, act as additional supervisors for the relevant workplan goals.

3.4 To ensure timeliness of completion of the e-PAS or e-performance document, if supervisors leave the United Nations, it is their responsibility to complete the Performance Management and Development System duties required of them prior to the date of separation. Separation procedures and processing of final entitlements of supervisors may be delayed until the evaluations for which they are responsible are completed.

Section 4
Staff members

4.1 All staff members shall fulfil their responsibilities under the Performance Management and Development System. Staff members are responsible for:

(a) Understanding the larger organizational goals;

(b) Soliciting clarification on individual performance expectations;

(c) Participating in discussions with the first reporting officer to facilitate the development and finalization of the individual workplan and maintaining discussions during the reporting period;

(d) Taking steps to complete each stage of the process for which they are responsible without delay.

4.2 Non-compliance with the terms of the present instruction by a staff member shall be recorded in his/her individual e-PAS or e-performance document and reflected in his/her overall rating. If the staff member does not take the required action on time to advance or complete the e-PAS or e-performance document, then the evaluation process may proceed outside the electronic application.

Section 5
Reporting officers and additional supervisors

5.1 A first reporting officer shall be designated for each staff member at the beginning of the performance cycle. The first reporting officer is responsible for:

(a) Developing the workplan with the staff member;

(b) Conducting the midpoint review and final evaluation;

(c) Providing ongoing feedback on the overall work of the staff member throughout the performance cycle;

(d) Advising, supporting and coaching the staff member on professional development and in the development of a personal development plan;

(e) Developing a performance improvement plan in consultation with the staff member in the case of performance shortcomings or underperformance, if applicable;

(f) Ensuring that all e-PAS and/or e-performance documents of staff supervised are completed in accordance with the prescribed procedures.

5.2 Up to two additional supervisors may be designated when a staff member works for more than one supervisor for more than 25 per cent of his/her time or for assignments of at least 30 working days, provided such arrangements are put into place with the agreement of the first reporting officer at the workplanning stage or at the beginning of the additional assignment or when the staff member's supervisor changes during the cycle.

5.3 The second reporting officer, who shall be the first reporting officer's supervisor or equivalent, is responsible for:

(a) Ensuring that the first reporting officer understands and applies the Performance Management and Development System principles and procedures;

(b) Holding the first reporting officer accountable for developing, together with staff, workplans with fair and consistent performance expectations and ensuring linkages between department/office priorities and individual workplans;

(c) Holding the first reporting officer accountable for the timely appraisal of the staff member's performance;

(d) Providing ongoing feedback and evaluating the first reporting officer's ability to manage the performance of his/her supervisees;

(e) Resolving disagreements between the staff member and the first reporting officer in the implementation of the Performance Management and Development System;

(f) Overseeing the establishment and implementation of a performance improvement plan in case of performance shortcomings or underperformance, as provided for in section 10 of the present instruction.

5.4 The second reporting officer also has the broader responsibility of ensuring that the Performance Management and Development System is consistently and fairly applied across work units by all first reporting officers who report to him or her. The second reporting officer shall ensure fairness and consistency throughout the cycle, especially when defining performance expectations and communicating performance standards. The second reporting officer ensures consistency between the competency and core values ratings, the comments and the overall rating of individual staff members for a given performance cycle. A staff member normally has one second reporting officer at any given time throughout the reporting cycle.

5.5 Non-compliance with the terms of the present instruction by the first or the second reporting officer shall be recorded in his/her e-PAS or e-performance document and be reflected in his/her overall rating. To this effect, the first and second reporting officers' workplan shall include a goal for timely implementation and compliance of the Performance Management and Development System.

Section 6
Departmental priorities, work unit and individual plans

6.1 Prior to the beginning of the performance cycle, and for the purposes of strengthening accountability in the Secretariat, senior managers meet with the Secretary-General and develop a compact and a human resources action plan. Priorities of heads of departments/offices/missions are translated into workplans of work units as per each department/office/mission structure. Work unit plans are developed in consultation with staff members concerned on an annual or biennial basis, depending on the needs of the department/office/mission.

Individual plans

6.2 At the beginning of the performance cycle, supervisors shall meet with the staff under their direct supervision to ensure that the objectives of the work unit are understood and individual workplans are prepared. Supervisors may meet with the staff in their work unit either as a group or individually.

6.3 First reporting officers shall work with staff members they supervise on the development of the staff member's individual workplan for the performance cycle. The workplanning stage includes: (a) establishing individual performance evaluation criteria by setting goals/key results/achievements; (b) defining core competencies, managerial competencies (where applicable), and job-related competencies (where applicable); and (c) formulating a personal development plan, as follows:

(a) Workplan: each staff member, together with his or her first reporting officer, prepares a draft workplan for discussion between the staff member and the first reporting officer. Upon the discussion and an agreement with the first reporting officer, the staff member revises, if necessary, and submits the final workplan to the

first reporting officer. The format of the workplan may vary depending on the functions of the staff member, but must include results-oriented elements such as goals/key results/achievements; actions to undertake to achieve each goal/key result/achievement; and measurement through a statement of success criteria, performance expectations and behavioural indicators to evaluate performance at the end of the cycle. When more than one staff member performs the same function, performance expectations may be collectively developed, while allowing for individual variations, where appropriate;

(b) Competencies: the organizational competencies listed in ST/SGB/1999/15[2] define a performance standard against which all staff can be consistently and objectively evaluated. All staff members are held accountable for demonstrating the three core values of integrity, professionalism and respect for diversity/gender equality. In the discussion of the workplan, the staff member and first reporting officers shall select the most relevant competencies related to the goals/key results/achievements identified for the reporting cycle and, where appropriate, managerial competencies. Staff with managerial or supervisory responsibilities must include managing performance among the selected competencies for the reporting period, and they will be held accountable for the effectiveness of their implementation of the Performance Management and Development System. Specific job-related competencies may be added where appropriate;

(c) Personal development plan: every staff member is expected to complete a development plan. Staff members may indicate competencies they wish to strengthen and career aspirations for future assignments. Every staff member is also expected to set a minimum target of five days for professional development per year in accordance with the learning and development policy (see ST/SGB/2009/9).

Section 7
Midpoint performance review

7.1 During the course of the year, the first reporting officer and the staff member should hold conversations and dialogue, formally and informally, and may have exchange of e-mails and/or other written communication on the progress of the performance goals set for the year. These conversations or written communications should address recognition for good performance and any shortcomings as they become apparent at any time during the cycle.

7.2 The first reporting officer should conduct a midpoint review, usually six months after the creation of the workplan, after discussing with the staff member the progress to date of the goals/key results set in the workplan. The review should indicate the progress made, and justify any updates to the workplan goals/key results. The first reporting officer should also note the progress made in demonstrating the competencies and the progress on the personal development plan. Staff members may note the progress made on the goals set in the workplan, the competencies and the personal development plan.

7.3 The signature of the staff member on the e-PAS or e-performance document constitutes an acknowledgement that the midterm review has been completed. It

[2] The organizational competencies are further explained in the booklet entitled *United Nations Competencies for the Future*.

does not indicate that parties are in agreement. In case of disagreement between the staff member and the first reporting officer about the progress of the workplan to date, efforts to resolve the dispute shall be by both parties, with the assistance of the second reporting officer when necessary.

Section 8
Appraising performance

8.1 Within three months after the end of the performance appraisal cycle, the first reporting officer and the staff member shall meet to discuss the overall performance during the cycle. Alternatively, the discussion may take place by telephone or videoconference.

8.2 Prior to the end-of-cycle discussion between the first reporting officer and the staff member, the staff member is encouraged to conduct a self-appraisal of the manner in which he or she has carried out the workplan defined at the beginning of the performance cycle. The self-appraisal can contain a short description of the progress to date related to each goal/key result/achievement, and comments on his/her competencies demonstrated during the period and the achievement of the personal development plan.

8.3 The first reporting officer shall evaluate the extent to which the staff member has achieved the goals/key results/achievements as set out in his/her workplan. The first reporting officer shall also evaluate and comment on the manner in which the staff member has demonstrated the core values and competencies. The first reporting officer may comment on the staff member's self-appraisal in his/her evaluation of the staff member. First reporting officers are encouraged to discuss the career aspirations of staff during the end-of-the year discussion. An overall rating on the staff member's performance shall be given by the first reporting officer pursuant to section 9 below.

8.4 To reflect a fuller range of performance, feedback from additional supervisors should be taken into account by the first reporting officer, provided the requirements of section 5.2 above have been met.

8.5 Evaluations are reviewed by the second reporting officer, who may make comments, as appropriate. All parties shall sign the completed e-PAS or e-performance document. The signature of the staff member constitutes an acknowledgement that the performance review has been conducted. It does not indicate that the staff member is in agreement with the evaluation. The rebuttal process provided for in section 15 below cannot be initiated unless the staff member has signed off on the finalized evaluation. If an e-PAS is submitted for signature to a staff member and the staff member does not sign, the e-PAS is considered to be signed by the staff member after 14 days of its receipt by the staff member. A staff member who does not sign his/her e-PAS shall be so informed and the 14-day period for submission of a rebuttal statement by the staff member pursuant to section 15.1 below shall commence as of the date of notification to the staff member.

Section 9
Rating system

Individual core values and competency ratings

9.1 Staff shall be appraised on the basis of the indicators that correspond to each of the core values and competencies and shall be given one of the following four ratings:

- Outstanding;
- Fully competent;
- Requires development;
- Unsatisfactory.

9.2 Each of these individual ratings establishes the level of demonstration of each of the core values and competencies by the staff member during the performance cycle. The appraisal should be based on the degree to which the individual has been observed as acting or behaving in accordance with the particular competency or value. Competency and core value ratings are a basis for staff development and shall be taken into account when determining the overall performance ratings.

Overall performance ratings

9.3 Staff who have met or exceeded performance expectations should be given one of the following two overall ratings:

- Exceeds performance expectations;
- Successfully meets performance expectations.

9.4 These two ratings establish full satisfaction with the work performed and justify awarding a salary increment in accordance with section 16.3 below. These ratings shall be so viewed when staff members are considered for selection for a post at the same or higher level, without prejudice to the discretionary authority of the Secretary-General to appoint staff members.

9.5 A rating of "exceeds performance expectations" should be considered in cases where the staff member has surpassed the success criteria and/or performance expectations for the majority of the defined goals/key results and/or has continually gone beyond expectations; significantly surpassing success criteria and/or performance expectations in quantity and quality.

9.6 A rating of "successfully meets performance expectations" should be considered in cases where the staff member has fully achieved the defined success criteria and/or performance expectations for the majority of the goals/key outputs during the performance cycle.

9.7 Staff who have not fully met performance expectations should be given one of the following two overall ratings:

- Partially meets performance expectations;
- Does not meet performance expectations.

These two ratings indicate the existence of performance shortcomings.

9.8 A rating of "partially meets performance expectations" should be considered when the staff member did not meet the defined success criteria and/or performance expectations for some of the goals/key results but demonstrates potential to develop the required skills.

9.9 A rating of "does not meet performance expectations" should be considered when the staff member did not meet the defined success criteria or performance expectations for the majority of the goals/key results; and the staff member demonstrates an inability to develop the required skills.

Section 10
Identifying and addressing performance shortcomings and unsatisfactory performance

10.1 During the performance cycle, the first reporting officer should continually evaluate performance. When a performance shortcoming is identified during the performance cycle, the first reporting officer, in consultation with the second reporting officer, should proactively assist the staff member to remedy the shortcoming(s). Remedial measures may include counselling, transfer to more suitable functions, additional training and/or the institution of a time-bound performance improvement plan, which should include clear targets for improvement, provision for coaching and supervision by the first reporting officer in conjunction with performance discussions, which should be held on a regular basis.

10.2 If the performance shortcoming was not rectified following the remedial actions indicated in section 10.1 above, and, where at the end of the performance cycle performance is appraised overall as "partially meets performance expectations", a written performance improvement plan shall be prepared by the first reporting officer. This shall be done in consultation with the staff member and the second reporting officer. The performance improvement plan may cover up to a six-month period.

10.3 If the performance shortcoming was not rectified following the remedial actions indicated in section 10.1, a number of administrative actions may ensue, including the withholding of a within-grade salary increment pursuant to section 16.4, the non-renewal of an appointment or the termination of an appointment for unsatisfactory service in accordance with staff regulation 9.3.

10.4 Where at the end of the performance cycle performance is appraised overall as "does not meet performance expectations", the appointment may be terminated as long as the remedial actions indicated in section 10.1 above included a performance improvement plan, which was initiated not less than three months before the end of the performance cycle.

10.5 Should unsatisfactory performance be the basis for a decision for a non-renewal of a fixed-term appointment and should the appointment expire before the end of the period covering a performance improvement plan, the appointment should be renewed for the duration necessary for the completion of the performance improvement plan.

Section 11
Implementation and monitoring by heads of departments and offices

11.1 Heads of departments/offices/missions are responsible for the implementation of the Performance Management and Development System process. To enhance managerial accountability at all levels, Performance Management and Development System implementation is included as a key indicator in the human resources action plans in order to emphasize the importance of senior management leadership in performance management.

11.2 Primary responsibility for the timely execution of the Performance Management and Development System, overall compliance and consistent and fair implementation rests with the head of department/office/mission. The head of department/office/mission shall promote communication between staff members and their supervisors, encourage ongoing feedback and dialogue and ensure that any change in the mandate or priorities of the department/office is communicated to the staff.

11.3 Each department/office shall report to the Office of Human Resources Management (OHRM) on compliance, consistency and fairness in the implementation, ratings and other relevant data no later than 30 June of each year. Each peacekeeping operation and special political mission shall submit this information to the Field Personnel Division of the Department of Field Support, which shall collate and forward the information to OHRM. The Executive Office or Human Resources Office for the department/office should ensure that completed individual official records are maintained.

11.4 The head of the department/office/mission shall hold all managers and supervisors accountable for the effective use of the Performance Management and Development System through all stages of the process and provide advice and recommendations where warranted. The head of department/office/mission should ensure that the department/office/mission priorities are communicated to all staff members of the department/office. The head of department/office/mission may also establish performance standards for the department or office as the basis for individual success criteria.

11.5 One of the functions of the senior management team of each department/office/mission should be to assist the head of department/office/mission in establishing a performance and development strategy for the department/office/mission and its implementation, as provided for in section 11.1 above.

11.6 At least once a year, the senior management team of each department/office/mission shall devote a meeting to performance management. At that meeting, the team should review staff development and career support needs in the light of strategic human resources management issues for the department/office/mission, including training and succession management. The team may also provide guidance on recognition of successful performance or addressing performance shortcomings at the departmental/office/mission level.

Section 12
Joint Monitoring Group

12.1 A Joint Monitoring Group shall be established by each department/office or by region or duty station outside of headquarters. The members of the Group shall be

appointed by the head of department/office. The Group shall normally consist of two members nominated by management, two members nominated by the staff from the department/office, in accordance with local practice, and a chairperson selected by the head of the department/office in consultation with the staff. Each member shall serve for a two-year renewable term.

12.2 The Under-Secretary-General for Field Support, in consultation with the Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations, and the Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs shall establish Joint Monitoring Groups on a regional basis, as appropriate.

12.3 Each Joint Monitoring Group shall monitor and review the implementation of the Performance Management and Development System by the departments/offices/missions concerned with respect to timeliness of the process and compliance with its purpose and procedures provided in section 2. Joint Monitoring Groups shall work with the respective departments/offices/missions to support the institutionalization of the Performance Management and Development System. The Joint Monitoring Group may request the heads of departments/offices/missions for statistical information necessary for the discharge of its functions. The Office of Human Resources Management may provide ex officio support in the provision of this information or the preparation of these consolidated reports.

12.4 The Joint Monitoring Group shall meet once a year at the end of the performance year. It shall report to the Global Joint Monitoring Group no later than 31 July of each year. The Joint Monitoring Group reports shall include a compliance review of the end-of-year appraisals and an overall summary of the Performance Management and Development System implementation process in each department/office/mission for that year.

Section 13
Global Joint Monitoring Group

13.1 The Global Joint Monitoring Group shall be a subsidiary body of the Staff-Management Coordination Committee. It shall be composed of two members nominated by management, two nominated by the staff and a chairperson appointed after staff consultation by the President of the Staff-Management Coordination Committee. Each member shall serve for a one-year renewable term.

13.2 The Global Joint Monitoring Group shall meet once a year, immediately prior to the annual meeting of the Staff-Management Coordination Committee. It shall examine policy issues related to the implementation of the Performance Management and Development System across the Organization. It shall review the reports submitted by Joint Monitoring Groups and prepare an annual report on the implementation of the Performance Management and Development System in the various departments/offices/missions. That report shall include recommendations on the implementation and overall effectiveness of the Performance Management and Development System and shall be submitted to the Staff-Management Coordination Committee for onward transmittal to the Secretary-General.

Section 14
Rebuttal panels

14.1 In consultation with the staff representatives of the department/office/mission concerned, the head of the department/office/mission, or his or her representative, shall draw up a list of rebuttal panel members composed of three groups of staff members from the department/office/mission concerned, in equal numbers. The list shall be composed as follows:

(a) Rebuttal panel members designated by the head of the department/office/mission;

(b) Rebuttal panel members designated by the staff representatives of the department/office/mission in accordance with local practice;

(c) Rebuttal panel chairpersons, selected by the head of the department/office/mission after consultation with the staff representatives of that department/office/mission.

The approved list, subdivided as indicated above, shall normally comprise nine individuals in all for large departments/offices, and six for smaller departments/offices. However, if a department/office determines that a larger membership pool is needed, it may expand the membership by adding one or more members to each of the groups specified above. Every effort shall be made to obtain an appropriate geographical and gender balance, where possible. Members must have adequate knowledge and experience required to review the appraisal and its rating. The head of the department/office shall inform the staff in writing of the composition of the approved list.

14.2 Rebuttal panel members shall serve for a two-year term. In the event that a member of the rebuttal panel is assigned to functions outside the department/office concerned, he or she shall be replaced in accordance with the procedure relevant to the group to which the rebuttal panel member belongs.

14.3 Where it is not possible to constitute a list from the staff members of that office, the approved list may include staff members from other offices at the same duty station, provided those staff members have the knowledge and experience required to review the appraisal and its rating.

Section 15
Rebuttal process

15.1 Staff members who disagree with a "partially meets performance expectations" or "does not meet performance expectations" rating given at the end of the performance year may, within 14 days of signing the completed e-PAS or e-performance document, submit to their Executive Officer at Headquarters, or to the Chief of Administration/Chief of Mission Support, as applicable, a written rebuttal statement setting forth briefly the specific reasons why a higher overall rating should have been given. Staff members having received the rating of "consistently exceed performance expectations" or "successfully meets performance expectations" cannot initiate a rebuttal.

15.2 The rebuttal statement shall contain the names of the three individuals, one from each of the three groups identified in section 14.1, whom the staff member has

selected to serve on the rebuttal panel, each of whom is equal in grade or higher than the reporting officer whose evaluation or comments are being rebutted.

15.3 After receiving a copy of the rebuttal statement, the head of department/office/mission, or his or her representative, shall, within 14 days, prepare and submit to the rebuttal panel a brief written statement in reply to the rebuttal statement submitted by the staff member. A copy of the reply to the rebuttal statement shall be given to the staff member. Unless geographical location makes it impractical, the panel shall hear the staff member, the first and second reporting officers and, at the discretion of the panel, other individuals who may have information relevant to the review of the appraisal rating. Telephone statements may also be taken where geographical separation so dictates.

15.4 The rebuttal panel shall prepare, within 14 days after the review of the case, a brief report setting forth the reasons why the original rating should or should not be maintained. In the event that an overall rating or comments should not be maintained, the rebuttal panel should designate the new rating or modify the narrative on performance evaluation. The report of the rebuttal panel shall be placed in the staff member's official status file as an attachment to the completed e-PAS or e-performance document and communicated to OHRM, or the Field Personnel Division of the Department of Field Support, as appropriate.

15.5 The performance rating resulting from the rebuttal process shall be binding on the head of the department/office/mission and on the staff member concerned, subject to the ultimate authority of the Secretary-General as Chief Administrative Officer of the Organization, who may review the matter as needed on the basis of the record. Any change in the final rating, and the date of the decision, shall be communicated to OHRM with an annotation that the rating was changed as a result of a review of the performance management and development rebuttal and the final rating recommended by the rebuttal panel.

15.6 Should unsatisfactory performance be the basis for a decision of non-renewal of an appointment and should the appointment expire before the end of the rebuttal process, the appointment should be renewed for the duration necessary to the completion of the rebuttal process.

15.7 The rating resulting from an evaluation that has not been rebutted is final and may not be appealed. However, administrative decisions that stem from any final performance appraisal and that affect the conditions of service of a staff member may be resolved by way of informal or formal justice mechanisms.

Section 16
Performance Management and Development System and salary increments

16.1 Under staff rule 3.3 (a), the granting of salary increments is subject to the satisfactory performance and conduct of staff members as evaluated by their supervisors, unless otherwise decided by the Secretary-General in any particular case. The determination that service is satisfactory in respect of performance and the procedures for withholding a salary increment when such a determination cannot be made are governed by the provisions of this section.

16.2 The decision to award or withhold a salary increment on the basis of performance shall be made by the second reporting officer, based on the rating awarded by the first reporting officer as reflected in the e-PAS or e-performance document.

16.3 The following ratings, as specified in section 9.3, shall justify a determination that awarding a salary increment is warranted:

- Exceeds performance expectations;
- Successfully meets performance expectations.

16.4 The following ratings as specified in section 9.7 above shall justify a determination that awarding a salary increment is not warranted:

- Partially meets performance expectations;
- Does not meet performance expectations.

16.5 When the salary increment is withheld because performance "partially meets performance expectations", the increment will be withheld pending the outcome of a performance improvement plan. If the staff member's performance improves following the completion of the performance improvement plan, he/she shall be granted the salary increment effective the date of successful completion of the performance improvement plan.

16.6 The decision to withhold a salary increment shall be communicated to the staff member in writing, before the decision is implemented, with a copy to OHRM, or to the local human resources office at offices away from Headquarters and regional commissions, or the Field Personnel Division of the Department of Field Support, for peacekeeping operations and special political missions.

16.7 Should the Performance Management and Development System rating on the basis of which a salary increment has been withheld be upgraded at a later stage as a result of the rebuttal process described in this section, and should the new rating justify the award of the salary increment, that increment shall be awarded and made effective as from the date on which it would have otherwise been paid.

Section 17
Performance Management and Development System e-forms and guidelines

17.1 The Performance Management and Development System document and guidelines are available to all staff on the Internet and through their relevant executive and human resources offices.

17.2 The Performance Management and Development System guidelines are intended solely for general guidance and information. Should there be any inconsistency between the guidelines and the text of the present instruction, the provisions of the instruction shall prevail.

Section 18
Entry into force and transitory provisions

18.1 The present instruction shall enter into force on 1 April 2010.

18.2 ST/AI/2002/3 is hereby abolished. However, performance appraisals anterior to the performance cycle 2010-2011 shall be conducted and completed in accordance with the procedures described in ST/AI/2002/3.

(*Signed*) Angela **Kane**
Under-Secretary-General for Management